Claim No: ARB 005/2026

IN THE DUBAI INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL CENTRE COURTS

IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

BETWEEN

(1) OLEKSEI
(2) OLESJA
(3) OLIFF
(4) OLEXI
(5) OLINIJIA
(6) OLIMIPIANA
(7) OLLEY

Claimants/Applicants

and

(1) OLORUN
(2) OLOV
(3) OLUMIJI
(4) OLULUABOE
(5) OLUSHEGUN

Defendants/Respondents

ORDER WITH REASONS OF H.E. JUSTICE SIR JEREMY COOKE

UPON hearing Counsel for the Applicants and Counsel for the First Respondent and Counsel for the Fourth Respondent at a hearing held before H.E. Justice Sir Jeremy Cooke on 26 January 2026 (the "Hearing")

AND UPON the Order with Reasons of H.E. Justice Sir Jeremy Cooke dated 28 January 2026 (the "Order")

AND UPON the First Respondent's costs submissions dated 29 January 2026 and the Statement of Costs dated 30 January 2026

AND UPON the Fourth Respondent's costs submissions dated 2 February 2026

AND UPON the Applicant's costs submissions dated 9 February 2026

AND UPON the First and Fourth Respondent's reply costs submission dated 11 February 2026

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Claimant shall within 28 days of this Order pay the First Respondent the sum of AED 92,000.

2. The Claimant shall within 28 days of this Order pay the Fourth Respondent the sum of AED 87,177.82

Issued by:
Delvin Sumo
Assistant Registrar
Date of issue: 24 February 2026
At: 8am

SCHEDULE OF REASONS

1. The First and Fourth Respondents succeeded at the Hearing and are prima facie entitled to their reasonable costs. I do not consider that this case is outside the norm so that there is no basis for an award of costs on the indemnity basis.

2. There was arguably no reason for the Fourth Respondent to appear at all as she was not accused of any wrongdoing but as she was served and succeeded in showing that the Court had no jurisdiction to make the orders sought, she is entitled to a costs order in her favour.

3. The First Respondent served a 3 page skeleton in which it made no express objection to the orders sought but at the Hearing jumped on the Fourth Respondents' bandwagon relating to jurisdiction and by counsel argued against the grant of the injunction on other grounds. It too is entitled to an order for costs.

4. In each case it is appropriate to assess the costs on a summary basis. However, there is good reason for reducing the sums claimed to sums reasonably incurred in the circumstances outlined above.

5. The lateness of the submission of costs schedules is borne in mind but no prejudice has been suffered by the Claimant who has had the opportunity to make submissions thereon.

6. As to the First Respondent's claimed costs:

(a) AED 85,500 is sought as solicitors' costs. Given the limited scope of what was done, I reduce these costs to AED 60,000.

(b) Counsel's fees of AED 32,000 are claimed as a disbursement which I allow in full.

(c) AED 90,000 is claimed in respect of an Italian lawyer's fees who is not registered under Part 1 and are disallowed in total as not incurred reasonably in connection with the claim.

7. As to the Fourth Respondents claimed costs:

(a) AED 116, 655 is sought inclusive of VAT.

(b) This appears to include expenses in the sum of AED 37,177.82, which I take to be Counsel's fees which I allow in their entirety

(c) The balance of the claimed costs appears to me to be excessive to a significant extent and I reduce the sums claimed to AED 50,000 in all, inclusive of VAT.